



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_45002
Title of the Manuscript:	COCOA FARMERS` INVOLVEMENT IN COCOA PRODUCTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Line 60 the first hypothesis “There is no significant relationship between the personal characteristics of farmers and the involvement in cocoa production-related activities” But according to the results, this is not true. 2. Line 63 the second hypothesis “the constraints faced by farmers and their involvement in cocoa production-related activities”, but this study did not analyse their relationship. In addition, the hypotheses are generally described from a positive view such as “There is significant positive relationship between A and B.” 3. Table 1, it is necessary to add description of the variables and their value, for example, sex, 1=female; 0=male? Regarding to primary occupation, the sum of the four percentages was not exactly 100%? 4. Line 186, involvement in cocoa production was a boundary of activities including Pre-planting/planting practices, Post-planting practices, Store management practices and Marketing practices. How was this variable “involvement in cocoa production” calculated? The sex, education and primary occupation were significantly related to respondents’ involvement in cocoa production. But I think these variables have different impacts on various cocoa production processes. In addition, this conclusion was contradictory to the first hypothesis. 5. Line 188, although these variables determined the extent to be involved in cocoa production, why would determine the quality of cocoa beans produced? Is it supported by any literatures? 6. Section CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION, this part was too simple. The conclusion was not summarized according to the results of this study, and did not give some targeted policy enlightenment	The findings of the research may not necessarily align with the hypothesis raised. Necessary corrections effected. Correction effected Correction effected The aspect of determining the quality of cocoa beans has been expunged from this part of the article; we could not find any literature to back it. The CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION have been re-written to capture the key aspects of the results of the study. Thanks for the observations.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Authors of this manuscript ascertained the characteristics of the Cocoa farmers, source of information on cocoa production-related activities and constraints faced by farmers in cocoa production-related activities. The topic is interesting and easy to follow, but I recommend major revision of this manuscript and publishing it only after specific modification of the current version are made.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. Reviewers' observations and comments were keenly followed and necessary corrections have been made in the manuscript. The corrections were highlighted in yellow.